REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

This communication is a full and timely response to the aforementioned final Office Action dated November 5, 2009. Claims 1, 16, and 21 are independent. Claims 3, 18, and 23 are cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-22, and 24-28 are pending in the application, and remain unamended. A clean copy of the claims is provided for the convenience of the Examiner.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12, 15-17, 19, 21-22, 24 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by over Finn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,002 hereinafter "Finn").

Dependent claims 8-11, 14, 20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Finn, and further in view of Hanna et al (WO 01/72012 hereinafter "Hanna").

Dependent claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Finn, and further in view of Hanna et al, and further in view of Silen et al. (U.S. PG Pub. 2002/0045442, hereinafter "Silen").

These rejections are respectfully traversed, because the Finn document fails to disclose all features of Applicants' independent claim.

Exemplary embodiments of the disclosure are directed to a method for remotely controlling and/or regulating at least one system 1. In an exemplary method, a validation code is generated that has a limited period of validity. The validation code is valid only once for a communication to be dispatched. Validity

information is added to the validation code to define a limited validity period for the validation code.

Information relating to the system 1, and the validation code (including the validity information) are combined. A communication device 2 assigned to the system 1 dispatches a communication that includes the information relating to the system, the validation code, and the validity information.

In an exemplary method, after the communication has been dispatched, a message is received and processed by the communication device 2. In the processing, a check code is extracted from the message. The validation code and the check code are used to check whether the message originates from a receiver of the communication. If the checking is successful, instruction information is extracted from the message, and the system 1 can implement the instruction information.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 21 broadly encompass features of the above-described embodiment.

For example, independent claim 1 recites a method including adding validity information to a validation code, which validity information defines the limited period of validity of the validation code. The claim 1 method includes dispatching the communication by a communication device assigned to the system, where the communication comprises the information relating to the system, the validation code, and the validation information. Claim 1 recites processing a message which the communication device receives after the communication has been dispatched, where the processing includes extracting a check code from the message according to a first extraction rule and checking whether the message originates from a receiver of the communication based on the validation code and the check code.

Finn does not disclose at least the foregoing features of claim 1, and has deficiencies similar to those discussed in Applicants' July 1, 2009 submission with respect to the Hill document (U.S. Patent 5,191,610). In this respect, the Finn document is merely cumulative to the previously relied upon Hill document.

Finn discloses a security system with random number remote communication between a remote signal device 22 and a receiver/controller 24. According to col. 5, lines 11-14 of Finn, the memory modules of the remote signal device 22 and the controller 24 have the same preselected random numbers in the same order. The receiver 24 "expects" the received numbers to be in the current location, or at least in a "sync window", of a pointer within the controller 24. The security system of Finn involves a synchronization of the pointers to the same preselected random numbers of the remote signal device 22 and the receiver/controller 24. See also col. 4, lines 36-38 of Finn.

The Examiner asserts that the random number generated by remote signaling device 22 of Finn corresponds to the validation code, as recited in claim 1. This assertion is unsupportable because Finn relies on synchronization of random numbers generated at different locations. Finn does not disclose adding any "validity information", as recited in Applicants' claim 1, to the generated random number, where the validity information defines the limited period of validity of a validation code. Also, Finn does not dispatch a communication that includes any separate validity information, as recited in Applicants' claim 1. On the contrary, Finn discloses that random numbers are used approximately once per month, but no information regarding a time limit of validity is ever transmitted. Finn's system relies upon the

synchronization of the respective random numbers of the remote signal device 22 and the receiver/controller 24.

Finn does not transmit data indicative of the one month time period or otherwise discuss such data. On the contrary, a transmitted message 60 includes a parity field 66, encrypted data 62 (which includes the random number), and counter value 64. None of these fields can be considered to correspond to Applicants' claimed validity information because they do not define the limited period of validity of the random number.

In Finn's system, the one-month time period that a send random number is valid is based on synchronization and makes the inclusion of validity information unnecessary. Accordingly, Finn teaches away from adding validity information or dispatching a communication including validity information, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that remote signal device 22 of Finn's patent corresponds to the communication device, as recited in claim 1. This assertion is unsupportable because the remote signal device 22 does not receive a message, as recited in claim 1, where a check code can be extracted that can be used in checking whether the message originates from a receiver of the transmission. Claim 1 recites that a communication device dispatches a communication and then a message which the communication device receives is processed.

The transmitted message 60 of Finn cannot correspond to Applicants' claim 1 message because it is not received by the remote signal device 22. On the contrary, the transmitted message 60 is received by the receiver/controller 24 and transmitted by the remote signal device 22, which the Examiner considers to correspond to the

communication device of claim 1. Accordingly, both the remote signal device 22 and the receiver/controller 24 of Finn do not process a message, as recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the claimed features of extracting a check code of the message, checking whether the message originates from a receiver of the communication based on the validation code and the check code, and if the checking is successful, extracting instruction information from the message and implementing the instruction information.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Finn does not disclose all features of Applicants' claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 16 and 21 are allowable for at least similar reasons to allowable claim 1.

In addition, claims 2, 4-15, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1, 16, and 21 and on their own merits.

For example, with reference to claims 8-11, 14, 20, and 25, Hanna does not remedy the deficiencies of Finn for failing to disclose all of the features of respective parent claims 1, 16, and 21. In another example, with reference to claim 13, Silen does not remedy the deficiencies of Finn with respect to all of the features of its parent claim 1.

Conclusion

All rejections raised in the Office Action have been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice thereof is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 5, 2010

By: Michael Wanek #63985
for: Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620